

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Specification

The Office Action mailed January 13, 2004 objects to the disclosure because of an informality on page 11, lines 21-22. The specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings filed with the patent application. In particular, the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review objects to Figs. 7 and 9 regarding the character of the lines, numbers, and letters. Revised versions of Figs. 7 and 9 are included herewith.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the revised Figs. 7 and 9.

35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action mailed January 13, 2004, Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 21-26, 28-31, 35-44, and 47-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,978,920 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 21-26, 28-31, 35-44, and 47-50 are not anticipated by Lee.

Lee discloses:

A computer system having a function of interrupting lewd/violent programs which includes a read-only-memory for storing an initialization program and a security grade setup program; a non-volatile memory device for storing a security grade which is a program classification code selected by a user for designating an unacceptable program content contained in an application program, and a password for identifying the user when changing the security grade; and a controller for controlling execution of an application program according to the security grade of the application program and the security grade stored in the non-volatile memory device during initialization, and for controlling the changing of the security grade stored in the non-volatile memory device during the security grade setup, when the user inputs a password that corresponds to the password stored in the non-volatile memory device. As a result, the computer system is able to limit access to application programs that contain unacceptable levels of graphic sex, violence, and strong language. Lee Abstract.

Although Lee discloses “a security grade which is a program classification code selected by a user designating an unacceptable program content contained in an application program” (Lee Abstract), the Lee reference fails to disclose the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

A game console, comprising:
a memory to store a plurality of parental control settings, wherein the plurality of parental control settings are associated with different media types;
a media reader to read content from the different media types; and
a processor coupled to the memory and the media reader, wherein the processor allows performance of the content read by the media reader if the parental control setting corresponding to the media type of the content being read is satisfied.

The Lee reference fails to disclose “a memory to store a plurality of parental control settings ... associated with different media types” as recited in claim 1. Although Lee discloses the use of security grades, the Lee reference fails to disclose multiple security grades associated with different media types. Lee discloses “Different security grades may be stored in security grade memory 17 in order to accommodate different levels of violence, vulgarity and lewdness of different application programs.” Col. 6, lines 53-56. However, providing different security grades for different application programs is not the same as storing multiple parental control settings associated with different media types. Further, Lee makes no reference to different media types. Instead, Lee discloses that a security grade is associated with an application program.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action refers to a reference in Lee that a television program may carry different program classification codes. See Col. 7, lines 26-31. However, this portion of Lee does not disclose multiple parental control settings associated with different media types. The Office Action alleges that an application program and a television program are different media types. However, Applicant submits that an application program and a television program are not different media types as recited in claim 1. In Lee, “application program” and “television program” refer to different content, not different media types. For example, claim 1 further recites “a media reader to read content from the different media types” (emphasis added). The media reader of claim 1 reads content from the media types. Therefore, content and media types have very different meanings. As such, Applicant submits that Lee’s disclosure of a television program and an application program fails to disclose the elements of claim 1.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 5-7, 9, 10 and 12 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 13 of the present application recites:

A method comprising:
identifying content from among each of a plurality of different media types to be executed on a game console and a corresponding rating thereof;
identifying a parental control setting stored in the game console for the media type of the identified content;
analyzing the content to be executed on the game console using the media type thereof and the parental control setting of the media type; and
executing the content on the game console if the rating of the identified content satisfies the parental control setting.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Lee reference fails to disclose “identifying content from among each of a plurality of different media types to be executed on a game console and a corresponding rating thereof” and “identifying a parental control setting stored in the game console for the media type of the identified content”. In particular, Lee fails to disclose identifying content from each of a plurality of different media types to be executed on a game console. As discussed above, Lee does not disclose multiple media types with multiple parental control settings associated therewith.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 13. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 14-16 and 21-22 depend from

claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 23 of the present application recites:

A method comprising:
identifying a media type of content to be accessed by a game console from among each of a plurality of media types;
identifying a parental control setting stored in non-removable memory of the game console and associated with the media type of content to be accessed by the game console;
analyzing the content to be accessed by the game console using the identified parental control setting; and
allowing the game console to access the content if the content satisfies the identified parental control setting and otherwise outputting a diagnostic.

The Lee reference fails to disclose “identifying a media type of content to be accessed by a game console from among each of a plurality of media types” as recited in claim 1. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Lee reference fails to disclose multiple media types. Accordingly, Lee fails to disclose identifying a media type from a plurality of media types.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 23. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 24-26 and 28 depend from claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 29 of the present application recites:

A user interface for a game console, comprising:
a main menu configured to identify different media types that may be played by the game console; and
a parental control settings menu accessible from the main menu to allow a user to set various content restrictions for each of the different media types that may be played by the game console.

The Lee reference fails to disclose “a parental control settings menu accessible from the main menu to allow a user to set various content restrictions for each of the different media types that may be played by the game console.” as recited in claim 29. As discussed above, Lee discloses the use of security grades but fails to disclose multiple security grades associated with different media types. Although Lee discloses providing different security grades for different application programs, such disclosure is not the same as allowing a user to set content restrictions for each of the different media types that can be played by a game console.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 29. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 30-31 depend from claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 35 of the present application recites:

A computer-readable medium for a game console comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, cause the game console to:

identify content to be played by the game console based upon different kinds of media types that can be played by the game console;

identify a parental control setting associated with the particular media type of the identified content;

determine whether the particular media type of the identified content satisfies the parental control setting; and

playing the identified content if the identified content satisfies the parental control setting.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Lee reference fails to disclose “identifying content to be played by the game console based upon different kinds of media that can be played by the game console”. In particular, Lee does not disclose identifying content from different media types. As discussed above, Lee does not disclose multiple media types with multiple parental control settings associated therewith.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 35. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 36-37 depend from claim 35, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 38 of the present application recites:

A game console, comprising:
a memory;
a processor;
a media reader for different media types and a corresponding rating associated with each of the different media types; and
a console application stored in the memory, wherein:
a control setting is stored in the memory for each said media type;
and
the console application, when executed by the processor, performs the media type read by the media reader except when the rating thereof does not satisfy the control setting for the media type.

Lee fails to disclose “a media reader for different media types and a corresponding rating associated with each of the different media types” as recited in claim 38. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Lee reference does not disclose multiple media types with multiple ratings associated therewith.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 38. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 38 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 39-44 depend from claim 38, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 47 of the present application recites:

A game console comprising:
means for reading different media types and a corresponding parental rating for each media type;
means for storing a console application and a control setting associated with each media type; and

means for executing the console application to perform the media type read by the media reader when the parental rating thereof satisfies the control setting for the media type.

The Lee reference fails to disclose “means for reading different media types and a corresponding parental rating for each media type” as recited in claim 47. As discussed above, Lee does not disclose different media types and a parental rating for each of the different media types.

Applicant submits that the Lee reference does not disclose the elements of claim 47. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is allowable over Lee. Given that claims 48-50 depend from claim 47, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Lee for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed January 27, 2004, claims 2-4, 8, 11, 17-18, 27, 32-34, 45-46 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 8, 11, 17-18, 27, 32-34, 45-46 and 51 are patentable over Lee.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Lee fails to disclose the use of multiple parental control settings associated with different media types. Further, Applicant submits that Lee fails to suggest the use of multiple parental control settings associated with different media types. Since Lee fails to mention multiple media types as recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that there is no suggestion to

provide different parental control settings associated with different media types. Since claims 2-4, 8 and 11 depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable over Lee.

Similarly, claims 17-18 depend from claim 13 (discussed above), claim 27 depends from claim 23, claims 45-46 depend from claim 38, and claim 51 depends from claim 47. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claims 17-18, 27, 45-46, and 51 are allowable over Lee.

Regarding claims 32-34, claim 32 of the present application recites:

A user interface for a game console, comprising:
a range indicator that identifies a range of content restriction levels that may be used by the game console for a plurality of different media types; and
a control movable relative to the range indicator to select a particular content restriction level corresponding to each said media type.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Lee fails to disclose the use of content restriction levels associated with a plurality of different media types. Further, Applicant submits that Lee fails to suggest the use of multiple content restriction levels associated with multiple media types. Since Lee fails to mention multiple media types as recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that there is no suggestion to provide different content restriction levels associated with different media types.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 32 is patentable over the Lee reference. Since claims 33-34 depend from claim 32, Applicant submits that those claims are likewise patentable over Lee.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 52-57 are allowable over the Lee reference for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Claims 1-18 and 21-57 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5-13-04

By: 
Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324-9256